This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,760	04/15/2002	Renato J. Recio	10003629-2	4255
22879 75	590 06/01/2004		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			LUU, LE HIEN	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			ARTONII	FAI ER NOMBER
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400		2141		

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			, ,			
		09/980,760	RECIO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Le H Luu	2141			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sneet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. maions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from Cause the application to become ABANDONE	rely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.			
Status			-			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04-15	5/2002 - 05/12/2004.				
2a) <u></u> □	is action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 2-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 2-25 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 April 2002</u> is/are: a)[
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 4/24/02; 5/12/04.	4) Interview Summary (Figure 1997) Interview Summary (Figure 1	e´.			

1. Claims 2-25 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 3. Claims 2-5, 10-12, 14-17, are 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chiussi et al. (Chiussi) patent no. 5,701,292.
- 4. As to claim 2, Chiussi teaches the invention as claimed, including a distributed computer system comprising:

links (col. 3 lines 39-45; connections in the network); and

end stations coupled between the links, wherein types of end stations include endnodes which originate or consume frames and routing devices which route frames between the links, wherein the end stations include a first source endnode which originates frames at a variable injection rate (col. 3 lines 48-65), wherein the first source endnode includes:

a congestion control mechanism responding to detected congestion by multiplicatively decreasing the variable injection rate (col. 4 lines 17-21; col. 4 line 58 - col. 5 line 11).

Art Unit: 2141

5. As to claims 3-5, Chiussi teaches the variable injection rate (IR) is multiplicatively decreased according to IR(i + 1) = IR(i) * (1/F1), wherein F1 is a constant. Chiussi also teaches the congestion control mechanism responds to detected subsiding of congestion by multiplicatively increasing the variable injection rate wherein the variable

Page 3

injection rate is multiplicatively increased according to IR(I+1) = IR(i) * F2 wherein F2 is

a constant (col. 4 line 58 - col. 5 line 11; col. 6 lines 33-37).

6. As to claims 10-11, Chiussi teaches at least one routing device includes a

congestion control mechanism detecting congestion on a path the frames route through

the at least one routing device; and wherein the at least one routing device includes

receive and send port resources, and wherein the at least one routing device's

congestion control mechanism detects congestion by analyzing the receive and send

port resources (col. 1 lines 14-54).

7. As to claim 12, Chiussi teaches at least one routing device includes: a

congestion control mechanism responding to detected congestion by dropping frames

that are marked droppable for a time period (col. 1 lines 14-54)

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Art Unit: 2141

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 9. Claims 6-9, 13, 18-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Chiussi et al. (Chiussi)** patent no. **5,701,292**, in view of **Lauck et al. (Lauck)** patent no. **5,734,825**.
- 10. As to claim 6, Chiussi teaches the invention substantially as claimed as discussed above. In addition, Chiussi teaches the end stations include a first destination endnode which consumes frames originated from the first source endnode, wherein the routing device includes: a congestion control mechanism detecting congestion on a path the frames route from the first source endnode to the first destination endnode (col. 4 line 58 col. 5 line 11). However Chiussi does not explicitly teach the destination endnode includes a congestion control mechanism for detecting congestion.

Lauck teaches end-to-end flow control has a destination end station detects congestion is occurring in the network (col. 1 line 59 - col. 2 line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chiussi and Lauck to provide a congestion control mechanism for detecting congestion at the destination endnode because it would control transmission rate of source endnode.

11. As to claim 7, Lauck teaches the first destination endnode's congestion control mechanism detects congestion based on Forward Explicit Congestion Notification (FECN) conditions, and forwards the FECN conditions to the first source endnode (col. 1 line 59 - col. 2 line 3).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2141

12. As to claims 8-9, Lauck teaches the end stations include a first destination

endnode which consumes frames originated from the first source endnode, wherein the

first source endnode's congestion control mechanism detects congestion on a path the

frames route from the first source endnode to the first destination endnode by

monitoring a previous variable injection rate and a round trip time for a frame to reach

the first destination endnode and an acknowledgement (ACK) for the same from the first

destination endnode to reach the first source endnode and the first source endnode's

congestion control mechanism detects congestion on a path the same route from the

first source endnode by monitoring acknowledgement (ACK) timeouts (col. 8 lines 46-

65; col. 13 lines 40-44).

13. As to claim 13, Lauck teaches at least one routing device includes: a congestion

control mechanism responding to detected congestion by applying link back pressure by

reducing a number of credits available for routing frames though the routing device from

a link (col. 14 lines 14-29; col. 14 line 66 - col. 15 line 2; definition of CB begins col. 16

line 52).

14. Claims 14-23 have similar limitations as claims 2-13; therefore, they are rejected

under the same rationale.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Le H. Luu, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9650.

Page 5

Art Unit: 2141

The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE").

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2141

Page 7

LE HIEN LUU PRIMARY EXAMINER

May 25, 2004